

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Fig. 2. This sheet, which includes Fig. 2-5, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 2-5. Fig. 2 has been redrawn to position the slot at an approximate 120 degree angle from one another. The third slot is not visible due to the perspective view of the drawing. This figure is being amended for consistency with the other figures illustrating this detail.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-13 are pending. Claims 1, 6-7, and 11-13 have been amended. Claim 2 has been canceled.

The drawing has been objected because of inconsistencies between different but related figures. The Office action states that the mechanical stop of Fig. 3 is different from the stop of Figs. 2 and 6-8, namely Fig. 3 shows 3 slots spaced 120 degrees from one another while Fig. 2 shows only two slots. Applicant respectfully states that Fig. 2 is the incorrect figure and that Fig. 3 is similar to Fig. 6-8. The third slot of Fig. 6 is not in view due to the perspective view of the mechanical stop. In addition, the side views shown in Figs. 7 and 8 only show one slot because the other two slots are on the opposing sides of the figure (i.e., spaced at 120 degrees) and are not viewable from this position. As a result, Fig. 2 is being changed to re-position the slots approximately 120 degrees from one another; however, the third slot is not viewable from this position (similar to Fig. 6), and therefore, is not being shown.

The specification has been objected to due to informalities. Applicant has amended the specification, specifically the abstract, to overcome the objection.

The rejection of claims 7 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention is respectfully traversed. Applicant has amended claim 7 and 11-13 to overcome the cited insufficiencies as cited by the examiner.

Claim 7 has been amended to recite proper antecedent basis for the statutory class of the invention.

Claim 7 has also been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for "said flange". The claim has been added to recite "each said respective flange extends axially" and "each said respective flange extends annularly" for providing proper antecedent basis. Moreover, claim 6 has been amended in light of the amendment to claim 7 to provide support for the each respective flange.

Claim 11 has been amended in accordance with the examiner's recommendation to recite that the mechanical stop prevents movement of the bushing along one direction.

Claims 12 and 13 have been amended similar to claims 6 and 7 to provide proper antecedent basis for "said flange"

Therefore, rejection to claims 7 and 11-13 should be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 1 and 4 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Schwab (U.S. 6,705,813) is respectfully traversed.

In response to the claims 1 and 4 that are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), applicant has amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitations of dependent claim 2 which was regarded as allowable subject matter in the Office Action but objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable.

Claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore allowable.

In accordance with the examiner's recommendation and applicant's amendments to the claims, claims 1 and 3-13 are in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/7/2006 
Frank L. Lollo
Reg. No. 48,854

MacMillan, Sobanski & Todd, LLC
One Maritime Plaza, Fourth Floor
720 Water Street
Toledo, Ohio 43604
Tel: 734-542-0900
Fax: 734-542-9569

(10/782,424)